REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Disclosure and Abstract have been objected to because they did not conform to U.S practice. Appropriate have been made to the specification by means of a substitute specification provided herewith, and the abstract has been amended accordingly. No new matter has been added. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended to overcome these rejections. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. In view of the amendment to the claims to recite specific steps involving the claimed process, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Larner et al. (US 6,104,638). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 10 now recites a method for restoring administrative data records of a nonvolatile memory that can be written in units of sectors and erased in units of blocks, the records being stored in a more rapidly accessible internal volatile flag memory of an assigned memory controller. The method includes, setting up, in one or more memory blocks of the nonvolatile memory, a contiguous reconstruction table (RKT), and continually updating the reconstruction table with records of all write and erase operations in the nonvolatile memory out of the internal flag memory. The step of continually updating comprises recording all

Appln. No. 10/518,636

Amdt. dated April 26, 2007

Reply to Office Action of February 1, 2007

information with which the administrative data records of the internal flag memory of the memory controller can be completely reconstructed in each case during a restart after a power failure. The method further includes starting a reconstruction when a predefined fill level of the reconstruction table (RKT) is reached, in each case to create a defined initial state of the administrative data records in the flag memory and in the reconstruction table (RKT), and recording the start of the reconstruction as a last entry (OE) in the reconstruction table. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

Applicant respectfully submits that Larner is not the same as the present claim invention for at least the following reasons. In particular, the present application claims a separate memory control apart from the host. Larner specifies only a processor 100, which is not a separate memory controller.

Additionally, according to column 2, lines 61 et seg., Larner keeps a table with parameters of the application like serial numbers, loads count, and hours of use as maintenance data, not a table of memory operations such as write and erase operations on the blocks of non-volatile memory. This administrative data is not within the scope of device taught by Larner.

Fig.1. of Larner only shows a general structure of a flash memory, not the structure of the reconstruction table provided by Applicant's invention.

Further, Larner does not teach that the construction table is brought into an initial definite state of the administrative data records. Larner teaches only that the parameters in the tables in RAM and flash memory are brought to the same current values. This is not a initial definite state, as recited in claim 10.

Appln. No. 10/518,636

Amdt. dated April 26, 2007

Reply to Office Action of February 1, 2007

Further, Larner shows no special last entry in the table, indicating a start of a

reconstruction. Only sequences numbers are used, which are counted continually. The first

entry in table is checked if entries are corrupted due to a power failure. This is different than

Applicant's claimed invention in which the start of the reconstruction process is recorded as the

last entry in the table.

In view of these differences, Applicant respectfully submits that Larner does not

disclose Applicant's claims invention arranged as in the claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is

thus respectfully requested.

In the view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits

that claims 10-17 are patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant requests reconsideration

and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is

now in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-

628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /Ronni S. Jillions/

Ronni S. Jillions

Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:jmv

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\B\Back\BAUMHOF1\PTO\2007-4-26Amendment.doc

- 9 -